



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

less close that the Classics reveal. They seem to me to suggest various things. First of all, they give evidence of the existence of a great body of slang in Greek and Latin. No one, indeed, who knows his Aristophanes and his Plautus or Petronius would venture to suggest that anything else was the case. And there is doubtless very little reason for believing even that the ancients had any less slang than we, for as every new excavation and every new papyrus from Egypt abundantly shows, they were men of like passions with ourselves. Only, aside from the old schoolboy idea that the Greeks and Romans were automatons, not humans, our practice in Greek and Latin composition, with its inculcation of the constant necessity of *ὡς εἶπεν* and *quasi, rls* and *quidam*, leads us naturally to believe that they were never venturesome in language without apologizing for it, and always steered clear of unusual words as Caesar warns one to do. And, of course, slang is nothing if not unusual and venturesome.

Further, on the side of their likeness, these parallels may help to show that at least an appreciable part of our current slang and colloquial speech is derivable from the Classics; that is, is due to our schoolboys and college men, and goes back to an original academic use. Of course, we must leave room for mere coincidence; many times and quite independently two or more nations in widely different ages may perfectly well have hit on phrases the same both verbally and in thought. We must take into account similarity of circumstances and of psychological processes. And on such grounds as these perhaps the majority of the resemblances quoted above should be explained.

But there are a number of reasons why we may think that in many other cases a more or less direct connection and not simple coincidence furnishes the real explanation, even though such connection cannot be traced out in full. An academic source and history and later popular use are not *a priori* incompatible. Many words in our language now popular were once learned. Again, many words which came obviously from the Classics, especially Latin or dog-Latin, although now in more or less respectable use, must originally have been colloquial or slangy, e. g. *nostrum*, *nincompoop*, *omniumgatherum*, *quidnunc*, *tandem*, *sophomore*. Most of these have been incorporated bodily, and their origin is easily recognizable. Where words are translated, however, the relationship is obscured. And yet in many phrases in common use we have obvious translations: *rare bird*, *Homer nods*, *sound mind in a sound body*, perhaps *willy-nilly* (*velim nolim, velit nolit*). A similar literary origin—not classical—is certain also for much English slang. Shakespeare is the source of some; so is the Bible—for example, of *Jehu*, *Jonah*, *raise Cain*, the two last, at least, thoroughly popular to-day. There is, therefore, rea-

son enough why some of our slang that resembles that of the ancients should be suspected of coming directly from them by way of translation, provided only that those who have studied Greek and Latin are likely to have performed such a service. And of this there can be but little doubt.

For students in school and college are unquestionably frequent users and coiners of slang, and at the same time greatly interested in certain sides of their Classics. Witness the numberless sonnets to fair Lalages that college papers publish, such punning schoolboy jokes as A motto for a young Ladies' Seminary—*iubet vicissim*¹; slang nicknames like *Dinnie* for *Eddie* from *δίνη* 'an eddy'; the batrachian college yell, *Brekekekex-coax-coax*. Numerous macaronic poems also show the same tendency of the undergraduate to turn his Classics to practical use.

The English undergraduate has both greater familiarity with the Classics than has the American and apparently an equally marked tendency to use slang, so that we may reasonably believe that he has done his share in translating ancient slang into English, as he certainly has in transferring Latin and Greek words bodily into present slang use. For example, among such learned English slang is *gyp*, a college servant, traditionally said to be derived from *γύψ*, 'a vulture', because of the cupidity of the class. *Kudos*, transliterated from *κῦδος* in Browning's fashion, is used in the sense of 'glory', 'prestige', and although the term has found considerable literary use, it must originally have been pure slang.

WILLIAM W. BAKER

Haverford College

LATIN WORD-ORDER AGAIN

Professor Preble's critique² of my earlier paper on order and emphasis in Latin deserves wide attention. It is gratifying to find that he concedes some of my contentions, notably the frequency of climax; this would include, I suppose, the climactic force of numerous connectives, such as *non modo . . . sed etiam*, and the like; and all this, as it seems to me, establishes my main assertion, that emphasis in Latin is, in general, progressive, forward-moving. My paper does not maintain that position determines emphasis absolutely, but that the Latin habit is to put the stronger or more significant word, phrase, or clause after the less important. It is conceivable that coordinate words, phrases and clauses might have been thus arranged, while the individual syntactical groups were built on the opposite principle; but this seems to me very unnatural, and therefore *a priori* very improbable. For the present, I am content to stand

¹ It might be noted that this pun plainly dates from a time since the introduction of the Roman method of pronunciation, as well as previous to the last decade's tremendous emphasis upon quantities, for *iubet vicissim* is not the sort of thing the trained modern vowel-marker would be guilty of.

² See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2, 110-114. Attention may be called also to a paper on Latin Word-Order, in The School Review for April, 1909, by Dr. C. H. Meader of the University of Michigan. C. K.

with Quintilian on the general principle.

Some of Professor Preble's examples and interpretations suggest the power of a theory to warp a scholar's judgment. My opinion against his proves nothing, of course; but it would be easy to submit some of the points of difference to a sort of arbitration, at once competent and impartial. Suppose a literal translation of Cicero be put into the hands of a master of the art of English expression, choosing one who is unacquainted with the original Latin or with theories of Latin order. Ask him to read Cato Maior, 31 and 32. After dwelling upon Nestor and Agamemnon, will he proceed thus: 'But now I *return* to myself. I *am passing* my four and eightieth year?' (Sed redeo ad me. Quantum ago annum et octogesimum). In § 56, shall we hear him say, 'But I *come* to the farmers, that I may not get away from my own case?' (Sed venio ad agricolas, ne a me ipso recedam). Will he finish Laelius thus: 'But of this man at another time: now I *return* to the augur?' (Sed de hoc alias; nunc redeo ad augurum). Of course, in Cato Maior 45, *ad me ipsum iam revertar*, *me* deserves emphasis for two reasons at least: the sense requires it, precisely as it does in the foregoing cases, and the intensive *ipsum* is added. If I were to hazard a guess at the reason for the different order and form of expression, I should say that Cicero, like every good writer, varies for the sake of variety, and as *revertar* is a much better word than *redeo* with which to close a sentence, he adds *ipsum* just because *me* is not in a position that suggests emphasis. The same might be said of *ne a me ipso recedam*. Sentences can be found without difficulty where emphasis really belongs on the first word or word-group; but to maintain that it is necessarily and regularly so, is quite a different matter.

Professor Preble goes so far as to suggest the emphasizing of prepositions to save his rule. He would read 'Not only from disaster, but also from the dread of disaster' (*calamitatis formidine*). But 'of' has no counterpart in Latin except the case ending: we are to infer that Cicero said calamitatis formidine? Again he extracts a thunderous BECAUSE out of a very innocent looking *eo* before *magis*; but the ablative of degree of difference regularly precedes. Shall we say everywhere for *quo . . . eo* and the like, 'THE more . . . THE more'? When a theory drives its champions to such lengths, one must congratulate one's self upon having thrown off its yoke.

Apparently my reason for citing strings of verbs, *veni, vidi, vici*, etc., was not clearly perceived. A note was made of climax in one example, but the purpose of the citations was to refute, if possible, the assertion that the Romans regarded the verb as the least emphatic element in the sentence. Most of the examples were from Terence, and poetry

is not the place to study emphasis in prose.

But Professor Preble wonders whether I would emphasize *Clodius* (Milo 34) three times in succession. We should all agree that he richly deserves it; but let us see.

In the first place, we must go back a little farther than Professor Preble does in order to catch the movement of the stream of thought. Cicero first states the conclusion of his preceding argument and makes his transition.

'You have heard, gentlemen of the jury, how greatly it was to the interest of Clodius that Milo should be slain; direct your attention now in turn to Milo. Why was it to Milo's interest that Clodius should be killed? What reason was there, I will not say why Milo should do the deed, but should even wish it done? "It was Clodius", you will say, "who was frustrating Milo's hope of the consulship". I answer, though he was opposing him, (Milo) was succeeding, nay more, he was succeeding all the better, nor did he find me a more valuable supporter than Clodius was'. (To parody a noted utterance, they loved Milo for the enemies he had made).

Professor Preble's slip in rendering *fiebat* as though it were *factus est*, though not necessarily fatal to his argument, does seem to me to obscure somewhat the proper emphasis. Of course, Milo was never elected consul.

To me it seems clear that *occidi MILONEM* is the chief thought in the first sentence. That *interfici CLODIUM* is in sharp and intentional contrast with *occidi Milonem*, and that *Clodium* therefore deserves strong emphasis seems equally plain. In the following sentence *Clodius* and *consulatus* are the indispensable words; *Miloni* might have been *huic* ('my client'). It stands where it does, if emphasis had anything to do with it, as a 'low level' between the two most emphatic words. In the third case, *Clodio* stands after *quam* and therefore in a stereotyped order (my article in The School Review 15, 643 ff., includes a brief comment on *quam*). Even here the most striking point is suggested by *Clodio*, though stress of voice is perhaps not needed to enforce it.

The foregoing translation was left wholly in Roman type, so as not to distract attention from the course of thought. In reading it, I should put a recognizable emphasis upon Clodius, Milo, slain (strongest upon Milo, because it is not only contrasted with the preceding Clodius, but the orator would already have in mind the approaching antithesis), Milo, Milo's (slight), Clodius, killed (slight, as an echo of 'slain'), do, wish (Milo is needed here only to avoid ambiguity), Clodius, consulship, succeeding (very strong), better (still stronger), me, Clodius. Here again, any who are interested might ask their colleagues in the department of public speaking to interpret this passage.

I dare not claim to be entirely free from that bias of the advocate which seems to me so apparent in others.

In order to think clearly about any such passage, we must note carefully the Latin form of expression. In *eo repugnante*, we have the weakest demonstrative in the ablative absolute with a participle, echoing a thought already expressed, and followed by a new and striking thought in the main verb *iebat*. So important is this assertion that Cicero with an *immo vero* repeats it in a still stronger form. How shall we be convinced that Cicero here expresses his most prominent, important, emphatic idea in an ablative absolute, and follows it, by "a Roman habit of thought", with the "least emphatic part in verb form"? When we render freely, 'despite his opposition', or the like, we introduce words relatively more important in the English sentence than the equivalents are in the Latin. 'Despite', or 'in spite of', indeed, are not in the Latin at all. They express and exaggerate the concessive notion which is merely suggested by the juxtaposition of the ideas of opposition and success.

It would be instructive, if we could know whether the friends of Professor Preble's theory would with practical unanimity approve the view that every one of the final words and word-groups in this passage is in "the position of least emphasis".

With these sample criticisms of Professor Preble's views and strictures, I must leave my contentions for the present to stand or fall on their merits. It would be interesting to learn whether any progress at all is making toward a common view. Perhaps the thorough-going advocates of the Greenough-Preble theory would be willing to answer a few queries.

(1) Do they emphasize in their class-rooms the frequency of climax in Latin, and the climactic force of certain connectives?¹ Do they instruct their pupils in composition to put the more emphatic or significant word, phrase, or clause after those that are less so, in a coordinate series?

So far as I have observed, there is not a line or even a word in Allen and Greenough or in Professor Preble's excellent grammar to indicate that climax has any place in Latin style, or any influence, on the order of words.

(2) Do they teach that the result clause is always less important than the clause on which it depends, unless it "precedes for emphasis"? And how many examples have they collected of the result before the cause?

(3) Do they teach that parenthetical clauses (*ut haec omittam* and the like) are always more important than regular purpose clauses following the verb?

¹ The writer found recently that out of a freshman division of about twenty men only one had ever heard this principle stated. Nearly all had used the Allen and Greenough grammar.

(4) Do they teach that the relative is regularly emphatic? (see A. and G., 598, e, second example). And have they attained facility in framing English examples in which the same thing is true? For instance, in the example just referred to above, colloquial English would omit the relative altogether ('the fellow-citizens we have lost', etc., *quos omisimus civis*).

(5) Do they guide their students to the proper emphasis through the sense and connection, as must be done in living languages, or do they encourage them to place the emphasis by a purely mechanical rule?

(6) And lastly, if Latin was really written by the aid of such a principle, will they not explain the fact that Quintilian had never heard of it? Certainly he distinctly affirms that if a word is to produce the strongest effect, it must be put not in the middle, nor (if silence is conclusive) at the beginning, but at the end.

I know by experience that it is not easy to see the weak points in a theory long accepted and taught. But all who even aspire to sound scholarship are of course desirous of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

JOHN GREENE

REVIEWS

Testimonium Animae, or Greek and Roman before Jesus Christ. Essays dealing with the Spiritual Elements in Classical Civilization. By E. G. Sihler. New York: G. E. Stechert & Co. (1908). Pp. 452. \$2.25.

American classical scholars have been very ready to contribute the results of their study and reflection to all kinds of publications, and in many cases these papers have been collected into volumes and constitute a valuable part of our literature; but otherwise, outside of editions and technical treatises, very few have published any extensive study of ancient life and conditions; consequently, the book under review is a unique appearance.

Professor Sihler is well known for his exact and searching scholarship; in his *Testimonium Animae* he gives evidence of these qualities on every page. He has a healthy contempt for second-hand sources, and for his knowledge of ancient conditions harks back in every instance to the ancient authors themselves. Such a practise is apt to lead to remarkable results, for throughout the long period of incrustation of commentary upon commentary, and of investigation upon investigation, the actual facts of ancient life have often been strangely hidden.

The book in brief is an investigation into the fundamental principles underlying the life of Greece and Rome before the advent of Christianity.

Before proceeding to the detailed examination of ancient life he discusses, in two introductory chap-